



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,355	08/06/2003	Russell L. Pond	042933/310237	8888
826	7590	08/21/2008		
ALSTON & BIRD LLP BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA 101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000 CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			EXAMINER	
			FRENEL, VANEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3687	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/635,355	Applicant(s) POND ET AL.
	Examiner VANEL FRENEL	Art Unit 3687

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-2, 5-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/0256/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the Amendment filed on 1/30/08. Claims 3-4 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claims 11-12 have been newly added. Claims 1, 5-12 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vazvan (WO 9745814, an IDS provided by the Applicant's) in view of Flom et al. (2001/0054087) and further in view Mamdani et al. (7,240,036).

(A) As per claim 1, Vazvan discloses a system for facilitating electronic payments in a food service setting using a mobile device enabled for short range proximity signaling and two way messaging (See Vazvan, Fig.6, Page 9, lines 11-41) said system comprising:

a proximity reader for interacting with said mobile device presented to said proximity reader by a user, wherein said proximity reader uses short range proximity signaling to trigger the initiation of a mobile payment session (See Vazvan, Page 9, lines 27-41);

a plurality of servers for providing authentication of user and processing payments (See Vazvan, Fig.2, Page 6, lines 9-27) ;
a plurality of point of sale terminals to provide access to transaction information (See Vazvan, Fig.3, Page 11-38); and a messaging system for providing mobile commerce messaging with said user, wherein said mobile commerce messaging includes digital content of at least one of digital cash (See Vazvan, Page 9, lines 11-22).

Vazvan does not explicitly disclose that the system having coupons, advertisements, games, ring-tones, graphics, videos via messaging, promotion of a plurality of different items to purchase.

However, these features are known in the art, as evidenced by Flom. In particular, Flom suggested that the system having coupons (See Flom, Page 2, Paragraphs 0012, 0015), advertisements (See Flom, Page 2, Paragraphs 0012, 0015), games (See Flom, Page 7, Paragraph 0068), ring-tones (See Flom, Page 7, Paragraph 0069), graphics (See Flom, Page 5, Paragraph 0056), videos via messaging (See Flom, Page 5, Paragraph 0056), promotion of a plurality of different items to purchase (See Flom, Page 5, Paragraph 0050, Page 6, Paragraphs 0064-0065).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Flom within the system of Vazvan with the motivation of providing offer, advertisement, or coupon to the user (See Flom, Page 2, Paragraph 0015).

As best understood, Vazvan and Flom disclose all the limitations above. Vazvan

and Flom do not explicitly disclose “wherein the plurality of servers communicate with the user for purposes of authentication via voice”.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Mamdani. In particular, Mamdani suggests the system having wherein the plurality of servers communicate with the user for purposes of authentication via voice” (See Mamdani, Fig.4; Fig.7; Col.4, lines 10-19; Col.12, lines 23-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Mamdani within the collective teachings of Vazvan and Flom with the motivation of enabling wireless e-commerce transactions to be facilitated and fulfilled in a secure and convenient manner (See Mamdani, Col.2, lines 10-12).

(B) As per claim 2, Vazvan discloses the system wherein the proximity reader provides an interface to download said digital content (See Vazvan, Page 9, lines 11-26).

4. Claims 5-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vazvan (WO 97/45814, December 4, 1997) in view of Meyer et al (5,933,812) and further in view of Mamdani et al.(7,240,036).

(A) As per claim 5, Vazvan discloses a method for facilitating the payment of products in a restaurant, said method comprising: using a mobile device enabled for short range proximity signaling and two way messaging to provide a short range

proximity signal to a proximity reader presenting said mobile device to said proximity reader (See Vazvan, Fig.6, Page 9, lines 11-41); providing identification information to a payment system (See Vazvan, Fig.2, Page 6, lines 9-27); receiving verification of identity information from the payment system at said mobile device (See Vazvan, Fig.6, Page 9, lines 11-41); ordering a plurality of products and accumulating charges (See Vazvan, Page 9, lines 34-41).

Vazvan does not explicitly disclose that the method has receiving on a display of said mobile device an electronic bill for a total charge.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Meyer. In particular, Meyer suggests that the method has receiving on a display of said mobile device an electronic bill for a total charge (See Meyer, Fig.21; Col.7, lines 37-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Vazvan within the system of Meyer with the motivation of providing a portable transaction data entry terminal that is especially suited for eating and drinking establishments (See Meyer, Col.3, lines 1-4).

As best understood, Vazvan and Myers disclose all the limitations above. Vazvan and Meyer do not explicitly disclose "wherein the verification of identity information includes indicia of a unique transaction confirmation code generated by the payment system".

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Mamdani. In particular, Mamdani suggests the system having "wherein the verification of identity

information includes indicia of a unique transaction confirmation code generated by the payment system" (See Mamdani, Fig.2 item 104b; Col.3, lines 55-67 to Col.4, line 25)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Mamdani within the collective teachings of Vazvan and Flom with the motivation of enabling wireless e-commerce transactions to be facilitated and fulfilled in a secure and convenient manner (See Mamdani, Col.2, lines 10-12).

(B) As per claim 6, Vazvan discloses the method further comprising: receiving a plurality of messages offering additional items to purchase on said display (See Vazvan, Page 8, lines 16-41); adding a plurality of additional charges to said electronic bill (See Vazvan, Page 8, lines 16-41); and approving of said total charge plus said plurality of additional charges (See Vazvan, Page 8, lines 16-41 to Col.9, line 10).

(C) As per claim 7, Meyer discloses the method further comprising: adding a tip to said electronic bill (See Meyer Col.2, lines 7-27); and approving of said total charge plus tip (See Meyer, Col.2, lines 7-27; Col.8, lines 58-60).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Vazvan, Meyer and Mamdani are as discussed in the rejection of claim 5 above, and incorporated herein.

(D) As per claim 8, Vazvan discloses the method wherein the verification of identity information is capable of being displayed in human readable form on display (See

Vazvan Page 6, lines 9-25).

(E) As per claim 9, Vazvan discloses the method wherein the verification of identity information is in machine readable form (See Vazvan Page 6, lines 9-25).

(F) As per claim 10, Vazvan discloses the method wherein the ordering of product is done automatically by the selection of the product itself (See Vazvan Page 8, lines 30-41 to Page 9, line 10).

(G) As per the newly added claim 11, Mamdani discloses the method wherein the unique transaction confirmation code is unique both to the mobile device and to a single present payment transaction, the method further comprising providing the unique transaction confirmation code to verify payment of the electronic bill (See MamdaniFig.2, Fig.8; Col.14, lines 15-26).

The motivation for combining the respective teachings of Vazvan, Meyer and Mamdani are as discussed in the rejection of claim 5 above, and incorporated herein.

(H) As per the newly added claim 12, Vazvan discloses an apparatus comprising: a proximity reader (See Vazvan, Page 9, lines 27-41); a display (See Vazvan, Page 12, lines 19-23); a processor coupled to the proximity reader and the display (See , Page); and memory coupled to the processor and having instructions that causes the processor to: provide a short range proximity signal to the proximity reader (See

Vazvan, Page 9, lines 27-41); providing identification information to a payment system (See Vazvan, Page 9, lines 27-41); submit an order for a plurality of products to a payment system (See Vazvan, Page 9, lines 34-41).

Vazvan does not explicitly disclose receive on the display of the apparatus an electronic bill for a total charge.

However, these features are known in the art, as evidenced by Myer. In particular, Meyer suggests receive on the display of the apparatus an electronic bill for a total charge (See Meyer, Fig.21; Col.7, lines 37-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Vazvan within the system of Meyer with the motivation of providing a portable transaction data entry terminal that is especially suited for eating and drinking establishments (See Meyer, Col.3, lines 1-4).

As best understood, Vazvan and Myers disclose all the limitations above. Vazvan and Meyer do not explicitly disclose "wherein the verification of identity information includes indicia of a unique transaction confirmation code generated by the payment system".

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Mamdani. In particular, Mamdani suggests the system having "wherein the verification of identity information includes indicia of a unique transaction confirmation code generated by the payment system" (See Mamdani, Fig.2 item 104b; Col.3, lines 55-67 to Col.4, line 25)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Mamdani within the collective teachings of

Vazvan and Meyers with the motivation of enabling wireless e-commerce transactions to be facilitated and fulfilled in a secure and convenient manner (See Mamdani, Col.2, lines 10-12).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/30/08 with respect to claims 1, 5-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not the applied art teaches transaction apparatus and method that identifies an authorized user by appearance and voice (6,023,688) and reservation method, reservation authentication method, reservation confirmation method, reservation servers, shop terminals, portable terminals and memory media (7,120,603).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vanel Frenel whose telephone number is 571-272-6769. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Gart can be reached on 571-272-3955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3687

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Vanell Frenel/

Examiner, Art Unit 3687

April 3, 2008